

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/878,515	06/11/2001	Thomas B. Brighton	47097-00066	3061	
30223	7590 08/02/2002				
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C.			EXAMINER		
SUITE 2600	ASHINGTON		RUDDOCK, UI	RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA	
CHICAGO, I	L 60606		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1771	2	
			DATE MAILED: 08/02/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.

Attachment(s)

6) Other:

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).

Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/878,515

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-5 and 21, drawn to a mesh reinforced breathable film, classified in class
 442, subclass 1.
 - II. Claims 6-20, drawn to a method of forming a mesh reinforced breathable film, classified in class 156, subclass 349.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The invention are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different products or (2) that the product as claimed can be made b another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another process, i.e. by heat sealing the mesh to the breathable film layer.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. During a telephone conversation with Zach Smolinski on June 7, 2002, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 5-21. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 6-20 are

Art Unit: 1771

withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The information disclosure statement filed February 11, 2002, has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 8. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sheth (US 4,929,303). Sheth disclose composite breathable films useful as a housewrap (abstract). The housewrap must be permeable to water vapor (col 1, ln 23-25). A preferred breathable film is produced from linear low density polyethylene (col 3, ln 3-6). The breathable film has a thickness of 4 to 6 mils, or .004 to .006 inches (col 4, ln 40-41). Fabrics suitably laminated to the breathable

Application/Control Number: 09/878,515

Art Unit: 1771

film include an open mesh fabric made of low density polyethylene, polypropylene, and preferably linear low density polyethylene or high density polyethylene (col 6, ln 39-50).

Page 4

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 10. Claims 5 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth (US 4,929,303), as disclosed above. Sheth discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching that the mesh strands have a width of from about 0.005 inches to about 0.060 inches and a depth of from about 0.005 inches to about 0.060 inches. It should be noted that optimizing the mesh strand width and depth are result effective variables. For example, increasing the width of a mesh strand would directly affect the strength of the mesh fabric. Furthermore, increasing the depth of a mesh strand would affect the strength of the laminate. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the mesh strands have a width of from about 0.005 inches to about 0.060 inches and a depth of from about 0.005 inches to about 0.060 inches, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205

Application/Control Number: 09/878,515

Art Unit: 1771

Page 5

USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In the present invention, one would have optimized the mesh strand width and depth motivated by the desire to obtain a mesh with increased durability and strength.

Conclusion

- 11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Thibodeau (US 4,285,998) discloses a polyethylene film and a polypropylene net, but fails to disclose that the film is breathable. Akao (US 4,653,640) discloses a polyethylene net and a polyethylene sheet, but fails to disclose that the film is breathable.
- 12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ula C Ruddock whose telephone number is 703-305-0066. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

UCR MUR

July 28, 2002

Vila Ruddock